

Carlisle Conservation Commission
February 27, 2020
Minutes

Pursuant to the notice filed with the Town Clerk, Vice Chair Angie Verge called the meeting to order in the Clark Room at the Town Hall at 7:02p.m. Also present were Commissioners, Alex Parra, Lee Tatistcheff and Helen Young and Conservation Administrator Sylvia Willard. Chair Dan Wells joined the meeting remotely via phone at 8:30 p.m. and arrived at 9:20 p.m. Commissioners Ken Belitz and Melinda Lindquist were not present.

Minutes:

*Parra moved to accept the **October 24, 2019** minutes with minor edit, Tatistcheff seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.*

*Tatistcheff moved to accept the **November 7, 2019** minutes with minor edits, Parra seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.*

Committee Liaison Reports:

Cranberry Bog Working Group (CBWG): The CBWG has determined that the March 4th Public Information Session should be cancelled so as not to interfere with the Master Plan Steering Committee's Community Input Session. Lindquist had recently provided for the Commission with a summary of the status of the CBWG's evaluation of future alternatives uses of the Cranberry Bog, to be discussed at the now to be rescheduled CBWG Public Information Session. The Commission's review of the draft outline was deferred until Lindquist can be present.

Cranberry Bog Public Survey: Young reported she has submitted an article for publication in the *Carlisle Mosquito* summarizing the preliminary results of the ongoing Cranberry Bog User Survey.

Master Plan Steering Committee: Verge announced she recently joined the Master Plan Steering Committee and encouraged Commissioners to attend the March 4, 2020 Public Input Session. She said the meeting will be an open house format, with posters placed around the school cafeteria in stations to be manned by MPSC and Master Plan Advisory Committee members, Civic Moxie representatives, and other knowledgeable individuals who will be available to answer questions and receive public input. Parra and Young agreed to attend on behalf of the CBWG.

Deer Control Committee: Willard said that when the hunting program was established, it was anticipated by the Commission that the deer committee support would be similar to the Foss Farm Gardens - seasonal. Now that the program has been underway for a couple of years, the Commission agreed it is in order to evaluate administrative support time requirements in advance of next season.

Certificate of Compliance:

(DEP 125-870) 119 Estabrook Road: Applicant: Cal McCarthy; Project: ATF Filing Restoration of due to unpermitted work within 100' Buffer Zone and a Bordering Vegetated Wetland; Issued: 9/1/2009

David Crossman of B&C Associates was present on behalf of the applicant to discuss requirements for obtaining a COC. He explained the current owners were not aware of open the OOCs when they purchased the property a year ago through a real estate auction process. A Notice of Intent that had been filed by the previous owner in accordance with the requirements of an Enforcement Order issued for unpermitted work is now expired.

Crossman said the current owners now have a buyer and have requested guidance on closing out the now expired OOCs. He said he has visited the site and found that one of the two Wetland Replication Areas located at the rear of the property was completed successfully, but the other, which is located next to the house, was never undertaken. The location of the WRA that was not undertaken was used for yard waste by the previous owner and also contains a substantial amount of invasive plant species. Crossman said he does not believe the restoration will require elevation changes because the surface water continues to flow even while impeded by the piles of debris.

The Commission determined the current owners will be required to submit a new Notice of Intent allowing the removal of the yard waste, removal of invasive plant species and planting of wetland plants and shrubs in accordance with his proposal based on the Wetland Restoration Plan submitted under the previous NOI, including ongoing monitoring.

7:36 p.m. (DOA-361) Request for Determination of Applicability, Continued Meeting

Applicant: Vintage Builders, Inc.

Project Location: 901 Concord Street, Map 4 Parcel 3-0 Lot 2

Project Description: Construction of a single-family dwelling and appurtenances outside the 100-foot Buffer Zone.

Verge opened the continued meeting and requested a motion to continue to March 12, 2020 at 7:15 p.m. at the applicant's request. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Young and passed unanimously. Present for the hearing was abutter James Honaker of 817 Concord Street, who reported there is ongoing cutting occurring on the lot. Verge, who is an abutter, agreed to investigate the matter.

7:38 p.m. (DEP 125-1065) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing

Applicant: John Nelson for the John Power Trust

Project Location: Skelton Road

Project Description: Installation of an 8-foot high cedar fence within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and within the 200-foot Riverfront Area.

Verge opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw and requested a motion to continue at the applicant's request to March 26, 2020 at 8:15 p.m. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Parra and passed unanimously.

The Commission determined this will be the last continuance granted since this project was filed just under a year ago, with no new information forthcoming.

Project Updates:

Westford Street Communications Tower Plan Change Request: Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Committee member David Freedman was present to discuss the proposed changes to the approved Plan of Record. These revisions, which have received Planning Board approval as a minor field change, include rotating the detention basin so there is less depth, and therefore less grading, in order to minimize disturbance of stone on site. There is no proposed change to the Limit of Work. Freedman noted the changes will not change the total number of mitigation plantings but will result in greater density of plants.

Willard reported MassDEP has approved the proposed changes relative to the Superseding OOCs issued for this project. *Tatistcheff moved to accept the proposed red line changes, Young seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

Garrison Place/81 Russell Street (125-0966), ATF for Wetland Restoration: Brendon Properties Project Manager, Joey LaPoint and Senior Wetlands Scientist Scott Morrison of EcoTec, Inc. were present to update the Commission on the work done to comply with the Order of Conditions to restore a Wetland Resource Area altered by the previous owner by removing debris and material located along and within the Wetland Resource Area (WRA) and removal of a large patch of Japanese knotweed (JK).

Morrison reported a substantial amount of restoration work has been done on the site in accordance with the Restoration Plan included in the OOCs and as amended in January 2020. Recent work included the removal of a large stand of JK to an off-site location where it will be incinerated. The area was then hydroseeded with Conservation Seed Mix and the wetland area recently planted with native species in accordance with the Commission's *Approved Plants List for Jurisdictional Projects*. Morrison noted they have included documentation of the purchase of the plant stock from Bigelow Nursery for the record because the plant ID tags were inadvertently removed prior to the Commission's ability to confirm the species.

Verge asked if there were ongoing monitoring requirements associated with the restoration planting, noting there is a concern about the likelihood of success for plantings done at this time of year. Morrison said he plans to evaluate the

restoration planting in May and June to confirm they are establishing successfully. Plants that do not survive will be replaced. Willard noted that although Wetland Restoration projects typically include monitoring for several years, this requirement was discussed during the long hearing process but was inadvertently omitted from the OOCs.

With regard to the JK removal, Morrison said the plan moving forward is to return in the spring, and Solitude Lake Management will treat any re-sprouting of invasive Japanese Knotweed with herbicide. Morrison referenced the recent photographs previously submitted to the Commission documenting the restoration work as it progressed. Willard reported Wells had expressed concerns during the recent site visit about how much JK remains, including the plants that have now become established beyond the erosion control boundary. Morrison confirmed the plants along the erosion control boundary will be included in the treatment to be done in the spring.

Tatistcheff requested clarification as to whether the Commission is being asked to consider the restoration work as completed or if they will be continuing work. Morrison said he believed the restoration work is largely complete, with the exception of some additional treatment of JK in the spring to address any re-sprouting. Verge said she has concerns with the maintenance plan because eradicating JK is a multi-year process. Morrison noted they did not propose to completely eradicate the JK within the Restoration Plan, since there are other patches scattered throughout the site and this would be difficult, if not impossible. Willard noted there is an area up in the woods where the previous owner stockpiled material, likely for use in the barn construction process, where there is a large stand of JK. She said there is the concern that this is going to spread over time onto the now town-owned conservation land.

Verge said it was her understanding that the reason they are approaching the Commission at this point is that they are seeking a bond reduction through the Planning Board. LaPoint confirmed and noted the wetland restoration was not originally part of the bond. Willard confirmed this was somehow overlooked during the Planning Board SROSC review process. LaPoint said the PB is now looking for a recommendation from the Commission relative to the status of the wetland restoration process as well as a value of work that will be required to complete the project. Morrison noted the Restoration Plan was amended in January 2020 to substitute foliar rather than stem treatment on re-emerging plants. He explained the reason for the change was that the Japanese Knotweed patch was considerably smaller when they started the project several years ago, and as a result, the original treatment plan would now result in the need to use a large amount of herbicide on a small area.

Verge noted there are specific times of year when it is appropriate to do foliar herbicide application. She said it is recommended to cut JK back in the spring and fill the hollow stem with herbicide and to return in the fall to do follow up foliar spraying when the plant is preparing for dormancy. She noted multi-year treatments are required and this can be very costly. Morrison said Solitude Lake Management has provided a rough cost estimate for a spring treatment only. He asked if the Commission wanted a formal proposal from SLM. Parra said the applicant would need to submit a formal proposal for completing the restoration to the PB as part of their bond reduction application.

Parra said it is his understanding that there are other requirements that have not yet been completed. Willard noted there is another area of concern observed during a recent site visit, where a large pile of gravel fill was observed in an area that could have been wetland, that they do not consider consistent with the Restoration Plan: *...“as this work is conducted, subsurface soil evaluations will be conducted to ensure that the soils are removed downgradient of the interface between hydric and non-hydric soils transition along the historical wetland boundary to restore any and all wetland resource areas that have been historically filled”*. She noted that the area of this material precluded confirmation of the wetland flags during the ANRAD/ORAD process. Regarding a stockpile of soil also on site, Morrison said the material had been there so long there was now topsoil on it, so they removed the JK and when he then cored into the middle, he found it was comprised of a sandy sub-soil. His concern was that if they spread the material out, it would not be a good growing medium, so he concluded that the best thing to do is leave it in place and hydroseed it. Willard said the concern is that there is now a substantial amount of JK root in the material and if they relocate it, they will introduce it to another site.

Verge said she had not been to the site and asked those that attended the site visit if they believed the gravel should be removed or the material should be left in place to avoid additional disturbance. Tatistcheff noted the area in question is a

replication area and if there is no hydric connection then it has not been successfully completed. Parra asked what the estimated cost would be to remove the material. Morrison said the removal would require the use of a machine to access the material and then the concern would be the potential for moving JK seeds or plant remnants to another location on the site. He said because of this his suggestion from a cost perspective would be to leave the material, which has now been hydroseeded, in place and direct the funds toward additional treatment.

Parra said he could accept that approach if the treatment were to be sustained over several years, not just a single treatment. Willard noted the area in question is potentially BVW and also within the 100-year Flood Zone and removal of the material was included in the restoration requirements within the OOCs. Verge reiterated her concerns that the removal of the material may have a more detrimental impact to the resource area. Tatistcheff said she agreed with Parra's suggestion that if the applicant is willing to make concessions on the existence of the gravel in exchange for a more extensive treatment plan, this is something the Commission could consider approving. Morrison suggested they could obtain a firm quote from SLM based on the Commission's suggestions, including additional treatments. The Commission agreed to accept the proposed treatment plan concessions upon receipt of a formal proposal from SLM to include spring and fall treatments this year followed by one in the spring of 2021.

570 West Street/Lion's Gate (DEP 125-0986): Additional erosion control has been installed in an area near the septic field and near the documented vernal pool.

8:10 p.m. (DEP 125-1085) Abbreviated Notice of Resource Delineation, Continued Hearing

Applicant: Chris Buono, All Things Real Estate

Project Location: 0 South Street, Map 5 Lots 54 and 56

Project Description: Review of 6,500 feet of Bordering Vegetated Wetland Resource Area delineation:

Verge opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

Professional Wetland Scientist David Cowell of Hancock Associates reported a peer review of the ANRAD submission was performed by Chief Environmental Scientist Dr. John Rockwood of EcoTec, Inc., who provided comments and feedback to which they provided responses, comments and revised plans. He said that at this stage, they are present to deliberate the conditions and discuss any additional feedback Dr. Rockwood may have relative to the revised plan.

Verge said there seems to be an issue in the determination of the stream designation. Under the previous ORAD, the USGS mapped perennial stream that bisects this property was determined to be intermittent with no associated Riverfront Area based on documented photographic evidence of dry conditions within the stream over a period of 4 consecutive days in any consecutive 12 month period, during a non-declared drought period. The ANRAD noted the resource area Inland Bank was not delineated as part of this filing and clarified that if a NOI is submitted in the future proposing to cross the stream we would have to identify the bank as it pertains to inland bank crossings.

John Rockwood of EcoTec, Inc. was present to discuss his peer review of the ANRAD submission filed for the property including boundaries of BVW and other field delineated wetland resource areas as outlined in his report to the Commission dated February 3, 2020 and in his comments relative to the plan revisions dated February 24 2020. He provided the Commission with an overview of his review based on a site evaluation conducted with Cowell on January 9, 2020. He noted he had reviewed a prior ANRAD on this property 2016. For the current ANRAD, several flags were revised, and/or added or removed, to accurately depict the current extent of the jurisdictional wetland boundaries, and as a result the 100-foot Buffer Zone must be adjusted and relocated by survey to reflect the flag changes. There are two certifiable vernal pools on the site as previously identified during his 2016 review, which Rockwood recommended the applicant be required to evaluate during the proper season so these areas may be properly classified and protected during subsequent permitting. The unmapped streams located within the eastern and western wetland systems are intermittent based upon stream mapping and watershed area and as such do not have an associated Riverfront Area.

With regard to the perennially mapped stream located in the central wetland system, Rockwood said the Commission must consider the evidence provided by the applicant to overcome the perennial designation. He noted the evidence provided with the current ANRAD is that which was used to overcome the perennial designation as determined in the now expired 2016 ORAD; therefore the finding that the stream was intermittent was extinguished when the ORAD expired. He said the question the Commission needs to answer now is whether the evidence extinguished when the ORAD expired. Parra said that in his opinion the evidence must be submitted and evaluated by the current commission. Cowell said their position on this is that although the ORAD expired, the evidence does not expire and is still credible evidence as submitted with this ANRAD. Willard commented on the poor quality of the photos submitted, which are reprints of photographs submitted with the 2016 ORAD, and on the fact that no signed affidavit was submitted with the current filing. Cowell said this was an oversight and they are providing tonight the sworn affidavit of two individuals. Willard said Wells had commented that this type of photographic evidence is typically provided for more than one location and is also located on the plan. Cowell said they would be willing to import that information onto their plan at the Commission's request.

Parra asked Rockwood for his opinion relative to the evidence that has been submitted. Rockwood said he found the stream flowing at the time of the 2016 inspection and during the current 2020 inspection. He noted the stream in question is a fairly small stream with a fairly small watershed area and the regulations preclude the use of StreamStats to overcome the presumption; instead, the applicant must provide 4 photographs taken during a consecutive 12-month period during a non-declared drought. He also noted the photos presented for this ANRAD were taken in 2015. Parra asked Rockwood what his interpretation of the Regulations referencing "...competent source". Rockwood said the Regulations define a Conservation Commission member, a Conservation Administrator, a MassDEP representative, or a Wetland Scientist as a competent source.

8:30 Wells joined the meeting via phone

Verge said the Commission has been discussing the evidence provided and asked Wells to share his comments relative to the determination of the stream. Wells said he believes the four plus-year time lapse necessitates updated documentation. He said he also believes the submission is lacking in information. He said in his professional experience on a site like this he would expect to have multiple areas of the stream documented in locations from where the stream enters the property to where it exits the property, since portions of the stream could dry up temporarily but other portions may never dry up. These locations should also be shown clearly on the plan for reference. Cowell said he wanted to note for the Public Record that the criteria for demonstration does not require 5 points; all it requires only one location; that if it does not flow for that period, the presumption is overcome. Tatistcheff commented they have submitted new copies of old evidence that are not marked on the plan. Cowell said they could import that data if the Commission requires that information.

Parra said that in fairness to the applicant, he wanted to state that he does not find this evidence particularly persuasive and that he agrees with Wells recommendation that additional documentation would be required to support your position. Parra asked Rockwood to clarify the meaning of overcoming the presumption, as to whether that means that based upon the evidence, although there is not presumption, that we can still find that it is perennial and not intermittent. Rockwood said the stream, under the Regulations, would be designated as perennial in the absence of evidence; if the commission finds the evidence to be inadequate, there is not evidence to overcome the regulatory perennial designation.

With regard to Rockwood's report that he observed a certifiable vernal pool with wood frog and spotted salamander egg masses during his 2016 review, Wells said upon his inspection this part of the stream looks like it could potentially provide vernal pool species breeding habitat, and because of this he would like to see the applicant perform a vernal pool evaluation this spring before making a determination. He noted that with the decision at the federal level, it is likely that federal protection for isolated wetlands is going to disappear; so it makes it all that much more important to determine what are certifiable vernal pools during this ANRAD process because they would receive protection under the WPA under Outstanding Resource Waters. Rockwood clarified that under the WPA, only vernal pools located within a Resource Area are protected under the act; so a vernal pool that is located in non-jurisdictional upland is not regulated under the Act, regardless of whether it is certified or not.

Verge said she believes it is important for the Commission to do their due diligence based on the size of the site to ensure all resources are identified correctly, so taking these additional steps are appropriate. The applicant will be required to provide a vernal pool evaluation and additional documentation supporting the intermittent designation including photographs with the locations shown on the plan.

Verge requested a motion to continue the hearing to March 12 at 7:15 with the representative's approval. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Young and approved unanimously.

Enforcement Orders:

8:50 p.m. Discussion of Arrowhead Lane Findings

Arrowhead Lane property owners were present to discuss the results of the soil testing report submitted by Licensed Site Professional Richard Doherty of Engineering & Consulting Resources, Inc. in December. The study was required under an Enforcement Order requiring an evaluation of questionable fill found on the site. The report showed none of the findings exceeded acceptable limits.

Parra noted the protocol adopted in determining what constitutes clean fill was Mass DEP's Acceptance Criteria; clarifying that it is not necessarily what the Commission would want to adopt in the future. He explained that the Commission had determined at the time the Enforcement Order was issued that they would not require removal and replacement of the fill if it did not violate MassDEP protocols under the WPA. He explained that this is not a determination as to any action the property owners may want to pursue with the developer. Belmonte said they just wanted confirmation that the Commission accepted the findings from the LSP so that they could move forward in whatever the next steps are in order to obtain COCs.

Verge said there are other outstanding requirements that must be met before the COCs can be considered, including relocating plantings and boulders that were not sited in accordance with the Plan of Record and the requirement that the erosion that is still occurring in some locations be addressed.

8:55 p.m. (DEP 125-1089) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing

Applicant: Wilkins Hill Realty

Project Location: Curve Street, Map 19, Parcel 19-39-X

Project Description: Construction of a proposed driveway, including tree clearing and grading with approximately 1,560 SF of wetland fill associated with the driveway crossing using an open-bottom box culvert; construction of a single-family home; installation of a water supply well; construction of a 1,610 SF Wetland Replication Area and associated grading

Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary presented the revised plan dated February 20, 2020 with the following changes made in response to comments at the previous hearing and a recent site inspection conducted by Wells, Young, Willard and Wetlands Consultant David Crossman of B&C Associates, including: (1) a north arrow has been shown on the plan; (2) the stream crossing calculations are now shown on Sheet 2 and meet or exceed the MassDEP Stream Crossing Standards; (3) a locus map has been added to Sheet 1; (3) the WRA is now >1.3x the wetland fill area; the wetland replication schematic and cross section on Sheet 2 have been updated accordingly.

Wells said he does not believe the Commission has sufficient information to confirm whether the ditch is an intermittent stream or an extension of the basin upgradient of it, noting there was no visible flow during the recent site inspection. He stated the Commission has documentation from a former commissioner of a documented vernal pool just upgradient of the ditch and within 100 feet of the proposed crossing location. His recommendation is that the applicant be required to provide a vernal pool evaluation, with the condition that if it is determined to be certifiable, the extent of the vernal pool must be flagged and added to the plan since this may have important implications on vernal pool habitat in relation to the proposed crossing location. He noted this is a timely matter since the season for evaluating vernal pool habitat is rapidly approaching and because the Commission does not want to go too far in the permitting process until they have this

information. He also noted that if the vernal pool is determined to be certifiable, this would trigger the submission of an Appendix B Wildlife Habitat Evaluation.

Wells also requested that all trees of 8 inches or greater, including dead trees, that are located within the Buffer Zone be located by survey and added to the plan prior to the Commission's next site walk.

Verge requested a motion to continue the hearing to March 12, 2020 at 7:45 p.m. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Parra and passed unanimously.

9:12 p.m. (DEP 125-1088) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing

Applicant: Gretchen Nelson

Project Location: 868 Concord Street

Project Description: Razing of an existing detached garage, construction of additions to an existing dwelling, installation of septic tanks for a new septic system and construction of a screen porch off an existing cabin, with work within the 100-foot Buffer Zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland and the Riverfront Resource Area

Verge opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw and requested a motion to continue the hearing to March 12, 2020 at 7:30 p.m. at the applicant's request. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Parra and approved unanimously.

9:20 Dan Wells joined the meeting

Enforcement Order - 778 East Street - Randy Brown, Issued: 2/7/2020: Direct filling of a small pond within Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW), using a line of stacked logs to create a log crossing and another line of logs located along the edge of the pond. Additional work consisting of clearing understory in BVW as well as clearing out an existing drainage swale that connects the pond and BVW to an existing culvert on a neighboring property. The property owner had previously been advised by the Conservation Administrator that any alteration of the protected resource area or its 100-foot Buffer Zone must be approved under a Wetlands Protection Act filing.

Additional work undertaken by the property owner subsequent to the issuance of the EO on February 7 includes placing rocks within an existing swale located within BVW, clearing out an existing drainage swale that connects the pond and BVW to an existing culvert on a neighboring property, and removal of understory vegetation within the BVW and likely within the 100-foot Buffer Zone. The Conservation Administrator had confirmed the property owner had removed the logs from the northern edge of the pond and from the middle of the pond but has since placed piles of saw dust in the pond where logs were removed, constituting wetland fill.

A revised EO dated February 26, 2020 was issued requiring that a Notice of Intent be submitted to the Commission by March 31, 2020 for the restoration of the pond and for restoration of the BVW. Upon approval of the plan, the restoration shall be undertaken under the direct supervision of a wetlands scientist with a monitoring report to be submitted to the Commission upon completion of the restoration activities following by two years of monitoring.

Brown said he had been undertaking the work to address mosquito control issues and has been in communications with Willard on an ongoing basis documenting his work. He said he believes there was a miscommunication and a misunderstanding of BOH bylaws regarding to mosquito control, which lead to his misinterpretation of permitted activities under the WPA. He reported he has been communicating with the BOH and will be on their agenda on March 12 to participate in a Mosquito Control Program update discussion.

Parra said regardless of any misunderstandings, the Commission's goal now is to bring the site into compliance with the WPA and in order to do that a NOI is required. Brown said he has requested a proposal from Stamski and McNary and is also in the process of finding a wetlands consultant to assist in completing the Notice of Intent submission. Wells suggested he also have the pond evaluated by the wetlands scientist in terms of potential vernal pool habitat.

Emergency Certificate: 634 West Street, Charles Tilford: Removal of a dead elm tree close to the common driveway and within a BVW that had been missed during the review of the property

Carlisle Conservation Commission
Meeting Date: February 13, 2020
Approval Date: May 15, 2020

Tatistcheff moved to approve the Emergency Certificate allowing the removal of the tree inadvertently not identified for removal as part of DEP 125-1083 wetland restoration project, Wells seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Budget Update :

Staffing: The Administrative Assistant position was approved by BOS for 35 hours and at Grade 6.

Greenough Dam Repair: Willard reported she is continuing to work with LSC member Warren Lyman to review the application and to identify aspects that need to be addressed prior to submitting an application.

Conservation Land Management:

Woodward Open Space Parcel– Monitoring Wells: Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary was present to review the plan for installing two sampling wells for the septic system at Woodward Village. The proposed locations, one upstream of the septic system, and one downstream from the septic system at the perimeter boundary, are required per Board of Health regulations to demonstrate the septic system is not sending total nitrogen off the property at concentrations higher than 5 mg/l above baseline conditions. The locations were chosen based on the level topography and are free of boulders and trees and upgradient of the wetland.

Carr provided a review of the sampling well detail, which involves digging by hand auger to 3 feet into the groundwater table, and filling with a 1-inch perforated PVC pipe surrounded by gravel, with topsoil compacted around the gravel surrounding the pipe. The downstream well is located approximately four feet from fairly well-maintained trail, which will provide easy access on foot. No machinery will be required for the construction of the wells. BOH regulation require yearly sampling initially, with frequency requirements reduced after time if nitrogen levels remain within limits.

Carr noted the proposed sampling wells are considered exempt from the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations per 310 CMR 10.02 (2) (b) (2) (g): *Activities that are temporary in nature, have negligible impacts, and are necessary for planning and design purposes.* He confirmed there will be no additional restrictions in allowable uses in the areas surrounding the sampling wells.

David Freedman, who has coordinated many aspects of the Woodward Village ROSC, stated he has confirmed with Town Counsel that the sampling easement that will be required to allow legal access to the sampling wells is not an impediment to the eventual placement of a CR on the Woodward Open Space Parcel.

Verge requested a motion to authorize the Conservation Administrator to communicate the Commission's lack of objection to the proposed sampling wells. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Young and approved unanimously.

Benfield Conservation Land and Septic Field Testing (DOA-357): The BOH has selected a peer reviewer of the Benfield Septic system

Towle Field Edge Clearing. The edge clearing done by the contractor has been completed; the DPW will be asked if they would be willing to assist with removal of the remaining woody debris.

Cranberry Bog - Beaver Lodge: The Commission deferred their decision regarding trapping until further information is received.

Land Use Permit: *Tatistcheff moved to issue a Land Use Permit to the Carlisle Congregational Church – to hold a Sunrise Easter Service on April 12, 2020 at Foss Farm. Parra seconded, and the motion as approved unanimously.*

Land Use Task Force: Tatistcheff volunteered to represent the commission in the review of potential changes in the Land Use Departmental structure.

Spring Meeting Dates: April 9 & 23; May 7 & 21; June 4 & 18

Annual Report: *Tatistcheff moved to submit the Annual Report to the Town Administrator as amended, Young seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

9:50 p.m. *Tatistcheff moved to adjourn, Wells seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Hopkins
Administrative Assistant

All documents presented can be viewed upon request in the office of the Conservation Commission